



# PENDLETON

SOUTH CAROLINA

History, Hospitality & Happenings!

Town of Pendleton Planning Commission  
Work Session  
October 15, 2009  
6:45 pm Town Hall

## MINUTES

**Members Present:** Susann Griffin, Coke Jeffords, Lou Robinson, Jim Smith, Dave Williford

**Members Absent:** Phillip Morgan, Joe Pearson (excused)

**Staff Present:** Kristopher Kurjiaka

### 1. Opening Comments

Jim Smith called the meeting to order at 6:48 pm. With five members present, a **quorum was established.**

### 2. Discuss protection standards for the commercial areas around and near the Town Square.

Mr. Smith stated that the Planning Commission received an updated copy of the *Maintenance and Protection Standards* document at the Regular Meeting. In addition to showing all the changes made from the previous month, which included changes based on the Public Meeting input, there were also a couple of other changes made by Mr. Smith and Mr. Kurjiaka since the Planning Commission packets were mailed.

Mr. Smith stated that with the Planning Commission packets was also included two small documents, one highlighting changes to be made in the Zoning Ordinance sections pertaining to the Design Review Board, the other concerning a new section establishing the Town Square Overlay District. He asked if Mr. Kurjiaka would like to explain these sections.

Mr. Kurjiaka stated that the changes in the Zoning Ordinance regarding the Design Review Board were needed due to different dynamics between the Corridor Overlay District and the Town Square Overlay District. The Design Review Board, as the Zoning Ordinance states, would be responsible for all



# PENDLETON

SOUTH CAROLINA

History, Hospitality & Happenings!

overlay districts, and some of what was included in the DRB section was based solely on the Corridor Overlay District. Mr. Kurjiaka noted that the in Section 603.1 the sentence that states, "Review by the Board is not required for repair, maintenance, and replacement with comparable materials, although building permits may be required for such work," should be omitted, as the review may be required for maintenance or replacement of features. In Section 603.3, Mr. Kurjiaka stated that signs should not be included, as they should be approvable by staff. He stated that variance procedures were listed on the back of the page that the Planning Commission received.

Mr. Kurjiaka stated that the other piece of information that was distributed to the Planning Commission was the proposed portion of the Zoning Ordinance which would establish the Town Square Overlay District as a district. This section was very much like the information sheet that was handed out at the Public Meeting, and included purposes, applicability of the guidelines, referenced the DRB section of the Zoning Ordinance for procedures, the Town Square Overlay District Maintenance and Protection Standards as district regulations, administrative procedures, repairing of features damaged by vandalism, and stated that the most restrictive between the overlay district and underlying district standards shall be the prevalent standards.

Mr. Smith asked the Planning Commission to pull out the newest draft of the Town Square Overlay District document that was obtained at the Regular Meeting. He stated that the title now includes the word "Maintenance", as that is one of the primary goals of the document. He stated that he would cover other changes as the PC went through the document.

Mr. Smith stated that on the bottom of Page 4, a couple changes were made. Since the document, with the additions of the definitions and demolition sections, was essentially six sections, the introduction should accurately reflect that. Each of the six major sections includes a short paragraph, some of which have been edited to make the introduction read better, others of which were just created.

Mr. Smith stated that on Page 7, "for Existing Buildings" was removed, as the "Maintenance Standards" were not just for existing buildings, but for each of the particular aspects on a property.

Ms. Robinson noted that the new "Maintenance Standards" section included all the items that were required to be met within 180 days.

Mr. Smith stated that the "Maintenance Standards" would need to be met continually after the initial 180 days, and that the document states that "further detailed information" is included for the items that have required maintenance.



# PENDLETON

SOUTH CAROLINA

History, Hospitality & Happenings!

Mr. Kurjiaka stated that one of the new items under “Maintenance Standards” was a section called “General Building Maintenance.” He asked if anyone had any issues with this section being in the document.

Ms. Griffin asked who would be administering all of the standards in the document.

Mr. Kurjiaka stated that it would predominantly be the Code Enforcement Officer for the Town. The Town Planner would also be involved in occasional random inspections to ensure that the standards were being met.

Mr. Smith asked the PC to turn to the “Awnings” section. He stated that the types of awnings allowed by the document were acrylic or vinyl coated canvas. After talking to a retailer who constructs awnings, he found out that there are three types of awning commonly used: 1) aluminum, which are the cheapest, 2) the coated canvas, which would last about 10 to 15 years, and 3) standing seam metal awnings, which have a life of about 20 plus years. He noted that the PC had been given a couple pictures at the Regular Meeting. These pictures were of standing seam metal awnings. Mr. Smith stated that he thought that the option of standing seam metal should be allowed to property owners, and that this being the most expensive option, it would rarely be used. He asked what the other PC members thought about this. All PC members were in agreement to allow standing seam metal awnings.

Mr. Smith stated that on Page 11 in the second to last paragraph, the words “If replacement is necessary” should be added.

Mr. Smith stated that on Page 12, Para 2, the word “original” should be changed to “earliest known.” Mr. Smith stated that in many cases where the word “original” was used, it has been changed due to the fact that few people would know what “original” was.

Mr. Smith asked the PC to look at the “Display Windows” section.

Ms. Griffin stated that in Para 1 of the section that she would prefer to see the word “shall” used instead of “should.”

Mr. Smith stated that the last paragraph in the “Display Windows” section should read, “Existing transom lights shall not be obscured by construction materials.”

Mr. Smith asked the PC to turn to Page 13, under the “Windows and Doors” section. In Para 6, he stated that the sentence did not make sense and should instead read, “Window surround and detailing such as brick or stone lintels and sills shall be maintained and preserved.”



Mr. Smith stated that on Page 14, Para 1 that the second sentence has been removed. Some of the existing doors on the Square would not fit the specifications listed, and the statement “proportional to display window glass” should adequately cover the size of glass required in doors.

Mr. Jeffords stated that in Para 2 that the sentence would better read, “Replacement doors shall be wood or metal.”

Mr. Smith asked the PC members to go to Page 14 under the section “Primary Façade Surface Treatment.” He stated that the first paragraph under that section had been deleted as it said the same basic thing as the second sentence. The second sentence would now read, “Any resurfacing of a building façade shall be done with red or dark red brick or materials similar to the existing primary façade surface treatment of the building being resurfaced. Metal shall not be used as the primary retreatment material for a façade.” He stated that the changes in this section were made to allow buildings that are currently stucco and that have never been anything besides stucco could be resurfaced without having to obtain a variance. The Planning Commission agreed.

Mr. Smith asked if there were any comments on the “Additions” section, as very little time had been spent on that section at the PC meetings.

Mr. Kurjiaka stated that there were multiple corrections that he would like to make to the section for clarification and to remove some of the contradicting wording present throughout that section. He asked if he could revise the section and have the PC review it prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Smith stated that the PC would get an opportunity to review the whole document prior to the next scheduled PC meeting and that it would not cause problems to have the PC review a revised “Additions” section at that time.

Mr. Smith stated that in the “Site Design Standards” section, the numbering had been changed since the yard standards were moved to the “Maintenance Standards” section.

Mr. Smith stated that in the “Lighting” section that a couple of changes were made to ensure that any lighting used on buildings would be compatible with already used in the public spaces around the Square.

Mr. Smith stated that in the “Signs” section, on Page 18, Para 3 that internally lit signs would not be allowed on the outside of buildings so the document would distinguish between internally lit signs that would be allowed inside a building.



# PENDLETON

SOUTH CAROLINA

History, Hospitality & Happenings!

Mr. Smith asked the PC to turn to the “New Construction” section. He stated that under “Form”, that the second paragraph could be removed as it repeated the same points made in other paragraphs in that section.

Mr. Smith asked if stucco should be allowed as a building material for façade treatment for new construction. The PC all agreed that stucco would be appropriate for use as a façade treatment for new construction.

Mr. Smith stated that the document also now includes a section called “Demolition” which sets forth regulations for the demolition of buildings on the Square. This section will highlight appropriate reasons for requesting the demolition of a structure.

Mr. Smith noted that there were three new definitions in the “Definitions” section. The addition of these definitions was the result of having terms in the document that needed explanation.

Mr. Smith asked if any of the PC members had any comments on the document or the schedule for the coming month.

No one had any comments.

### **3. Adjourn.**

With no further business, Mr. Smith called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Jeffords made the motion and Mr. Williford seconded the motion. The motion to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting ended at 8:15pm.